

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments to the Claims

Original claims 1-25 and previously added claims 26-36 remain in this application. No new claims have been added by this amendment or the dependency of any claims changed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

The Examiner objected to claim 31, saying there was insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “said truss” in the claim.

Independent claim 26, from which claim 31 depends, has been amended to provide antecedent basis by saying: “wherein each wood structural member is part of a truss....”

Claim 31 has also been amended to refer to plurality of trusses as amended claim 26 calls for a plurality of trusses.

Claims 34 through 36 which depend from claim 31 have been amended in a similar fashion to call for a plurality of trusses.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

The Examiner rejected claim 25 and 26, saying they were anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,201,627 (Biedenbach).

Claim 25

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s rejection of claim 25 on the basis that Biedenbach anticipates the claim.

First, the Examiner has not shown that Biedenbach teaches all of the limitations of claim 25, specifically: “means supporting at least one side of said wood structural members to limit deflection thereof....” The Examiner

has not shown how element 10 of Biedenbach limits deflection of the wood structural members that receive the wood screw fasteners.

Second, by this paper, claim 25 has been amended to specifically claim an edge-to-edge arrangement of the plurality of wood structural members. Note by this amendment, it is hoped that the abutting arrangement of the relatively narrower edge faces has been made clear and will be understood as different from the arrangement taught by either Biedenbach or Sanford. See the Examiner's Office Action of August 18, 2008 at page 4, regarding claim 27. Applicants believe that joining wood members in edge-to-edge abutting arrangement with screws is not taught by any combination of the references cited by the Examiner.

Claim 26

Applicants have amended claim 26 in light of the Examiner's rejection on the basis of Biedenbach.

By this paper, claim 26 has been amended to specifically claim that each wood structural member is part of a truss having top and bottom chords and the trusses are joined by screw fasteners without pre-drilling of the bores for the screw fasteners. Biedenbach does not teach using wood screws to join trusses having top and bottom chords.

It is believed that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Support for these amendments is found in the drawings.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claim 3

The Examiner rejected claim 3 saying it is obvious in light of U.S. Patent 5,201,627 (Biedenbach).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 3 on the basis that Biedenbach renders all of the elements of the claim obvious except for making a prebore for the fasteners.

First, the Examiner has not shown that Biedenbach teaches all of the limitations of claim 3, specifically: "means supporting at least one side of said wood structural members to limit deflection thereof...." The Examiner has not shown how element 10 of Biedenbach limits deflection of the wood structural members that receive the wood screw fasteners.

Second, by this paper, claim 3 has been amended to specifically claim an edge-to-edge arrangement of the plurality of wood structural members. Note by this amendment, it is hoped that the abutting arrangement of the relatively narrower edge faces has been made clear and will be understood as different from the arrangement taught by either Biedenbach or Sanford. See the Examiner's Office Action of August 18, 2008, at page 4, regarding claim 27.

Claims 18 and 27 through 30

The Examiner rejected claims 18 and 27 through 30 saying they are obvious in light of U.S. Patent 5,201,627 (Biedenbach) in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,911,690 (Sanford).

Claim 18

First, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 18 on the basis that Biedenbach renders all of the elements of the claim obvious except the wood structural elements are a truss, which is supplied by Sanford.

Claim 18 depends from claim 3, incorporating all of its limitations, and as noted above, the Examiner has not shown that Biedenbach teaches all of the limitations of claim 3, specifically: "means supporting at least one side of

said wood structural members to limit deflection thereof....” The Examiner has not shown how element 10 of Biedenbach limits deflection of the wood structural members that receive the wood screw fasteners.

Second, by this paper, claim 3 has been amended to specifically claim an edge-to-edge arrangement of the plurality of wood structural members. Note by this amendment, it is hoped that the abutting arrangement of the relatively narrower edge faces has been made clear and will be understood as different from the arrangement taught by either Biedenbach or Sanford. See the Examiner’s Office Action of August 18, 2008 at page 4, regarding claim 27.

Thus Applicant respectfully asks that the rejection of claim 18 be removed.

Claim 27

With respect to claim 27, Applicants have amended claim 26, from which claim 27 depends, to overcome the rejection of that claims based on Biedenbach alone. As noted above, Applicants believe that amended claim 26 is not anticipated by Biedenbach.

In addition, claim 27 has also been amended to overcome Examiner’s rejection of claim 27. The Examiner argued that Biedenbach renders all of the elements of the claim obvious except the wood structural elements are trusses, which the Examiner argues is supplied by Sanford.

In a fashion similar to claim 3, by this paper, claim 27 has been amended to specifically claim an edge-to-edge arrangement of the plurality of wood structural members. Note by this amendment, it is hoped that the abutting arrangement of the relatively narrower edge faces has been made clear and will be understood as different from the arrangement taught by

either Biedenbach or Sanford. See the Examiner's Office Action of August 18, 2008 at page 4, regarding claim 27.

Claims 28 through 30

Claims 28 through 30 depend from claim 27, incorporating all of its limitations. For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 27, Applicants believe claims 28 through 30 are now in condition for allowance.

It is believed that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Support for these amendments is found in the drawings.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Date: January 21, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
LAW OFFICE OF JAMES R. CYPHER

By /s Charles R. Cypher /
Charles R. Cypher
Reg. No. 41,694
Tel.: (510) 832-4111